

IN THE
ARIZONA COURT OF APPEALS
DIVISION TWO

THE STATE OF ARIZONA,
Appellee,

v.

DAVID VINCENT PETRI,
Appellant.

No. 2 CA-CR 2018-0292
Filed September 24, 2019

THIS DECISION DOES NOT CREATE LEGAL PRECEDENT AND
MAY NOT BE CITED EXCEPT AS AUTHORIZED BY APPLICABLE RULES.

NOT FOR PUBLICATION
See Ariz. R. Sup. Ct. 111(c)(1); Ariz. R. Crim. P. 31.19(e).

Appeal from the Superior Court in Pima County
No. CR20180024001
The Honorable Teresa Godoy, Judge Pro Tempore

AFFIRMED

COUNSEL

Joel Feinman, Pima County Public Defender
By Michael J. Miller, Assistant Public Defender, Tucson
Counsel for Appellant

STATE v. PETRI
Decision of the Court

MEMORANDUM DECISION

Presiding Judge Staring authored the decision of the Court, in which Chief Judge Vásquez and Judge Brearcliffe concurred.

S T A R I N G, Presiding Judge:

¶1 After a jury trial, David Petri was convicted of theft of a means of transportation, third-degree burglary, and possession of burglary tools. The trial court sentenced him to concurrent prison terms, the longest of which is ten years.

¶2 Counsel has filed a brief in compliance with *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), and *State v. Clark*, 196 Ariz. 530 (App. 1999), stating he has reviewed the record but found no “arguably meritorious issues to raise on appeal” and asking this court to review the record for error. Petri has not filed a supplemental brief.

¶3 Viewed in the light most favorable to sustaining the jury’s verdict, *see State v. Tamplin*, 195 Ariz. 246, ¶ 2 (App. 1999), the evidence is sufficient here, *see* A.R.S. §§ 13-1505(A), 13-1506(A)(2), 13-1814(A). In December 2017, Petri took a truck without permission and placed a different license plate on it; after his arrest, a “jiggle key” used for automobile theft was found in the truck.

¶4 Sufficient evidence supports the trial court’s finding that Petri had at least two historical prior felony convictions. The sentences imposed are within the statutory range. *See* A.R.S. §§ 13-703(C), (J), 13-1505(C), 13-1506(B), 13-1814(D).

¶5 Pursuant to our obligation under *Anders*, we have searched the record for error and found none. Accordingly, we affirm Petri’s convictions and sentences.